arXiv:1607.06027v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 20 Jul 2016

New Approach to Metal–Insulator Phase Transition Kinetics in Magnetic Field.

L.B. Dubovskii[1, 2, *]

[1] *Theoretical division , NRC"Kurchatov Institute", 123182 Moscow, Russia*
[2] *chair of theoretical physics, MFTI, 141700 Moscow region*

The metal–insulator phase transition is considered on the basis of Ginzburg-Landau type equations with two different order parameters. An inclusion of magnetic field in this picture is an important step for understanding of behavior of the metal–insulator phase transition kinetics. The magnetic field leads to various singularities of the surface tension and results in drastic variations of the phase transition kinetics. The strongest singularity is due to Landau diamagnetism and determines anomalous features of MI transition kinetics. This singularity supports the well known experimental fact that almost all semimetals behave like diamagnetic materials.

PACS numbers: 75.20.-g, 68.35.Md, 71.30.+h, 73.40.Ns

We investigate phase transitions from an insulator phase to a metal phase (MI phase transitions). Any MI transition in a crystalline material, at any rate at zero temperature, must be a transition from a situation in which electronic bands do not overlap to a situation when they do [1]. One of the overlapped bands is initially empty and gets carriers of electron type. The other one is initially entirely filled with electrons and gets carriers of hole type due to overlapping of the bands. Small band-crossing leads to two-band metallic state with small numbers of electrons and holes carriers per atomic cell. In addition, the numbers of holes and electrons are equal to each other. The situation is quite typical for common semimetals.

The MI phase transitions are the phase transitions of the first order. The description of these transitions is usually based on the common approach to the first order phase transition theory [2]. The leading parameter which provides the MI phase transition is the material density $\rho(\vec{r})$ of the phases. This parameter determines the first order type of the phase transition at a critical value of ρ_c. Here ρ_c is a function of pressure p and temperature T ($\rho_c = \rho_c(p, T)$). Generally, the pressure p is the leading parameter which governs the MI transition. A growth of density of the insulator phase leads to overlapping of two electronic bands. One of these bands is empty and the other one is filled with electrons. By overlapping of such bands the MI phase transition occurs with an appearance of a new order parameter which characterizes the density of current carriers in the system. This parameter equals identically zero in the insulator phase and grows from zero at the MI interface. This parameter exhibits itself as the second order phase transition parameter.

So, we can describe the MI phase transition by two order parameters (cf. [3–6]). One of the order parameters is the material density distribution $\rho(\vec{r})$ either of metal phase or of insulating one. The second parameter is the density of electrons and holes in two bands. The density of electrons and holes can be described by a vector in the Hilbert space with electronic and holes components $\Upsilon^+(\vec{r}) = (u^*_\uparrow(\vec{r}), u^*_\downarrow(\vec{r}), v^*_\uparrow(\vec{r}), v^*_\downarrow(\vec{r}))$. The components of the vector $\Upsilon(\vec{r})$ are functions of electrons for up and down spins $(u_\uparrow(\vec{r}), u_\downarrow(\vec{r}))$ and functions of holes for up and down spins $(v_\uparrow(\vec{r}), v_\downarrow(\vec{r}))$. In the absence of magnetic field all these components of the vector $\Upsilon(\vec{r})$ are real functions. We can put the following invariant scalar quantity

$$n(\vec{r}) = n_e(\vec{r}) + n_h(\vec{r}) \equiv \left(\Upsilon^+\Upsilon\right) , \qquad (1)$$

$n_e(\vec{r}) = |u_\uparrow(\vec{r})|^2 + |u_\downarrow(\vec{r})|^2$, $n_h(\vec{r}) = |v_\uparrow(\vec{r})|^2 + |v_\downarrow(\vec{r})|^2$. It determines densities of electrons and holes in the metal phase and becomes identically zero in the insulating phase at $T = 0$. We take the identity $n_h(\vec{r}) = n_e(\vec{r})$ due to the local electrical neutrality within the metal phase.

In the vicinity of MI phase transition, the Ginzburg-Landau (GL) functional can be assumed as a sum of contributions from order parameters $\rho(\vec{r})$, $\Upsilon(\vec{r})$:

$$\Phi = \Phi\{\rho, \Upsilon, \Upsilon^+\} = \int d\vec{r} F(\rho, \Upsilon, \Upsilon^+) ,$$
$$F = F_\rho(\rho(\vec{r})) + F_\Upsilon(\Upsilon(\vec{r})) + F_{int}(\rho(\vec{r}), \Upsilon(\vec{r})). \qquad (2)$$

The parameter $\rho(\vec{r})$ describes the first order phase transition between insulating and metal phases whereas the vector function $\Upsilon(\vec{r})$ of electrons and holes describes the second order phase transition. We expand the functional $F_\rho(\rho(\vec{r}))$ according to Cahn – Hillard approximation [7], see also [8]:

$$F_\rho(\rho(\vec{r})) = \varphi(\rho) + \frac{1}{2}\lambda(\rho)(\nabla\rho)^2 \qquad (3)$$

We use the GL expansion [9] for the vector function $\Upsilon(\vec{r})$

$$F_\Upsilon(\Upsilon(\vec{r})) = \alpha\left(\Upsilon^+\Upsilon\right) + \frac{1}{2}\beta\left(\Upsilon^+\Upsilon\right)^2 + \frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\left(\nabla\Upsilon^+(\vec{r})\nabla\Upsilon(\vec{r})\right);$$

$$\alpha = \aleph(\rho - \rho_c) \qquad (4)$$

Here we have expanded α linearly over ρ in the vicinity of ρ_c. It is in analogy with the well known expansion of the appropriate parameter in the Landau theory of the

second order phase transition on the temperature T [2]. The proposed expansion is convenient for an investigation of the MI phase transitions at a fixed temperature, say at $T = 0$. For simplicity, we have taken the masses of holes and electrons to be equal to each other. Also the interaction term $F_{int}(\rho(\vec{r}), \Upsilon(\vec{r}))$ is taken as a linear function of $n(\vec{r})$ (cf. [3–5]):

$$F_{int}(\rho(\vec{r}), \Upsilon(\vec{r})) = g(\rho)\left(\Upsilon^{+}\Upsilon\right) \tag{5}$$

The variation of $\Phi = \Phi\{\rho, \Upsilon, \Upsilon^{+}\}$ over $\rho(\vec{r})$ and $\Upsilon^{+}(\vec{r})$ gives the self consistent equations of GL type for MI phase transition:

$$\lambda^{1/2}(\rho)\nabla\left(\lambda^{1/2}(\rho)\nabla\rho(\vec{r})\right) = \frac{d\varphi}{d\rho}(\rho) + \frac{dg}{d\rho}\left(\Upsilon^{+}\Upsilon\right)$$
$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\nabla^2\Upsilon + (\alpha + g)\,\Upsilon + \beta\left(\Upsilon^{+}\Upsilon\right)\Upsilon = 0 \tag{6}$$

In the case $g \equiv 0$, the parameters ρ and Υ are independent and the surface tension Σ at the interface between the metallic and the insulating phases can be calculated separately for ρ (Σ_ρ) and Υ (Σ_Υ). The surface tension Σ_ρ can be calculated straightforward ([5, 8]):

$$\Sigma_\rho = \int_{\rho_{ins}}^{\rho_{met}} d\rho\sqrt{\varphi(\rho)\lambda(\rho)/2} \tag{7}$$

It should be emphasized that the value of Σ_ρ is of the order of the value of surface tension at the interface between an insulator and vacuum. It is well known from experiments [10] that the characteristic values of the surface tension at the interface between an insulator and vacuum are at least an order of magnitude lower than those at the interface between a metal and vacuum. The physical mechanism underlying this difference is related to the presence of conduction electrons penetrating from the interface to vacuum at a distance of the order of the separation between atomic layers in the metal [11]. So,

$$\Sigma_\Upsilon \gg \Sigma_\rho.$$

In most cases we can neglect Σ_ρ in comparison with Σ_Υ.

Now we consider the behavior of the system in magnetic field. The investigation of MI interface in the presence of magnetic field is a remarkably delicate task. The problem is quite similar for introducing of a magnetic field in Kohn-Sham scheme [12] based on [13]. One can understand the basic difficulty by considering the expression for the orbital current density:

$$\vec{j}(\vec{r}) = \vec{j}_p(\vec{r}) + \frac{e}{mc}n(\vec{r})\vec{A}(\vec{r})$$

For short, we assume the situation with only one conductivity band. The first term $\vec{j}_p(\vec{r})$ is referred to as "paramagnetic current density," and measures the density of canonical momentum in the wave function. It depends explicitly on the electron density $n(\vec{r})$ and the vector potential $\vec{A}(\vec{r})$. Here we should emphasize that the situation in normal metals differs drastically from that in superconductors. In normal metals the electron density $n(\vec{r})$ is a function of coordinates $\vec{r}$ whereas in the superconductors the electron density $n(\vec{r})$ is an integer number of electron charge value [14] and does not depend on coordinates $\vec{r}$ at all. The integer value is just $2e$ according to the microscopic theory of superconductivity [15]. The brilliant discussion of the problem in superconductors can be found in [16]. In [12] it is assumed that the fields, state and its energy are uniquely determined by the densities, and the paramagnetic current density. This statement would have not been true if we had attempted to work with the physical current densities $\vec{j}(\vec{r})$ as basic variable. In that case one would still have the freedom of operating a gauge transformation on the vector potential, and hence multiplying the wave function by a coordinate-dependent phase factor, *without changing* the physical current density. Therefore, the state wave function is *not* a unique function of $\vec{j}(\vec{r})$. Working with the paramagnetic current density $\vec{j}_p$ eliminates this ambiguity. In the presence of a magnetic field $\vec{B}$ the mapping between ground-state energy and ground-state wave function is not one to one. To recover a one to one mapping it is necessary to supplement the number density distribution by spin- and current- densities which play the same role with respect to an external field $\vec{B}$, and vector potential $\vec{A}$, as the density does with respect to ordinary scalar potential. In summary, the vector potential $\vec{A}$ should not be involved in the potential Φ for normal metals because the gauge invariance is violated.

We assume (cf. [17, 18]) that the state and its wave function are determined uniquely by $\vec{B}(\vec{r})$ and $\rho(\vec{r})$. The inclusion of paramagnetic effects can be carried out straightforward by adding an additional term into the functional (4):

$$F_{para}(\vec{B}, \Upsilon, \Upsilon^{+}) = \mu_{ph}\left(\Upsilon^{+}\vec{B}\vec{\Sigma}\Upsilon\right), \vec{\Sigma} = \begin{pmatrix}\vec{\tau_u} & 0\\ 0 & \vec{\tau_v}\end{pmatrix} \tag{8}$$

μ_{ph} is a phenomenological constant, $\vec{\tau_u} = \vec{\tau_v}$ are Pauli spinors [17] correspondingly for electrons and holes.

The functional $\Phi\{\rho, \Upsilon, \Upsilon^{+}\}$ (2) with the paramagnetic term (8) gives the energy spectrum ε_k of the system and the thermodynamical potential $\Omega(T, V, \mu)$ [2]:

$$\Omega = -T\sum_k \ln\left(1 + \exp\frac{\mu - \varepsilon_k}{T}\right), \quad \vec{M}(\vec{r}) = -\frac{\partial\Omega}{\partial\vec{B}(\vec{r})}.$$

$\vec{M}(\vec{r})$ is the magnetic moment of the metal and we assume that it depends exclusively on the electron density $n(\vec{r})$ or $(\Upsilon^{+}\Upsilon)$ (see (1)) and does not depend on $\rho(\vec{r})$, i.e.

$$\vec{M}(\vec{r}) = \vec{M}(n(\vec{r}))\ , \quad n(\vec{r}) = \Upsilon^{+}(\vec{r})\Upsilon(\vec{r}). \tag{9}$$

The magnetic field can be introduced as follows: $\vec{H}(\vec{r}) = \vec{B}(\vec{r}) - 4\pi\vec{M}(\vec{r})$.

The thermodynamical potential $\Phi\{\rho,\Upsilon,\Upsilon^+\}$ (2) with the additional term (8) is a function of the independent variables $T,V,\vec{B}$. It is inconvenient since $\vec{B}$ means the average of the microscopic magnetic field in the specimen. The value $\vec{B}$ cannot be fixed experimentally. Therefore we should fix the external magnetic field $\vec{H}$. It can be done by adding (see [19, 20]) the following value:

$$-\frac{\vec{H}\vec{B}}{4\pi}+\frac{\vec{H}^2}{8\pi}\equiv-\vec{H}\vec{M}-\frac{\vec{H}^2}{8\pi}$$

and consider the other thermodynamic potential with the independent variable $\vec{H}$:

$$\Phi_H\{\rho,\Upsilon,\Upsilon^+\}=\int d\vec{r}F_H(\rho,\Upsilon,\Upsilon^+)$$
$$F_H(\rho,\Upsilon,\Upsilon^+)=F_\rho(\rho(\vec{r}))+F_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}+F_{int}(\rho(\vec{r}),\Upsilon(\vec{r}))(10)$$

$$F_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}=F_\Upsilon(\Upsilon(\vec{r}))+F_{para}(\vec{H}+4\pi\vec{M},\Upsilon,\Upsilon^+)-\vec{H}\vec{M}-\frac{\vec{H}^2}{8\pi}.$$

The variation of $\Phi=\Phi\{\rho,\Upsilon,\Upsilon^+\}$ over $\Upsilon^+(\vec{r})$ for the fixed independent variable $\vec{H}$ gives the equation for Υ:

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\left(\frac{d^2\Upsilon}{dx^2}\right)+(\alpha+g\rho)\,\Upsilon+\beta\left(\Upsilon^+\Upsilon\right)\Upsilon+\mathbb{H}\Upsilon=0\,;\ (11)$$

$$\mathbb{H}\Upsilon=\mu_{ph}\begin{pmatrix}H_z & H_x & 0 & 0\\ H_x & -H_z & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & H_z & H_x\\ 0 & 0 & H_x & -H_z\end{pmatrix}\Upsilon-\vec{H}\frac{\partial\vec{M}}{\partial(\Upsilon^+\Upsilon)}\Upsilon\,.$$

Now we take $g\equiv 0$ and calculate the surface tension Σ_Υ. One by one, we shall consider two cases: 1) $\vec{M}\equiv 0$ and 2) $\mu_{ph}\equiv 0$. In the first case components of $\Upsilon(x)$ can be taken as real functions and an exact solution can be found. The first two matrix rows of Eq. (11) are not connected with the other two rows and they can be rewritten as the following set of two coupled equations for the components Υ :

$$\hat{L}(u_\uparrow,u_\downarrow)u_\uparrow+\mu_{ph}(H_xu_\downarrow+H_zu_\uparrow)=0$$
$$\hat{L}(u_\uparrow,u_\downarrow)u_\downarrow+\mu_{ph}(H_xu_\uparrow-H_zu_\downarrow)=0\,.\qquad(12)$$

Here $\hat{L}(u,v)$ is the following linear differential operator:

$$\hat{L}(u,v)\varphi=-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{d^2\varphi}{dx^2}+\alpha\varphi+\beta\left(|u|^2+|v|^2\right)\varphi\,.$$

Solution of the system (12) can be sought in the form:

$$u_\downarrow(x)=qu_\uparrow(x)\ ,$$

where q depends on H_x and H_z. The both equations of the system (12) become identical to each other under the following condition: $qH_x+H_z=H_x/q-H_z\,.$

So, we have $q=q_\pm$,

$$q_+=\frac{|H_x|}{\sqrt{H_x^2+H_z^2}+H_zsgnH_x}\quad,\quad q_-=-\frac{1}{q_+}\,.$$

The first equation of the system (12) can be rewritten:

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{d^2u_\uparrow}{dx^2}+\tilde{\alpha}u_\uparrow+\tilde{\beta}(1+q^2)|u_\uparrow|^2u_\uparrow=0\ ;$$
$$\tilde{\alpha}=\alpha+\mu_p(qH_x+H_z)\,,\ \tilde{\beta}=\beta(1+q^2)\,;\ q=q_\pm\ .\ (13)$$

We can also $\tilde{\alpha}$ represent as follows

$$\tilde{\alpha}=a(\rho-\rho_{c\vec{H}})\,,\quad \rho_{c\vec{H}}=\rho_{c0}-\mu_{ph}HsgnH_xa^{-1}\ ,$$

$H=\sqrt{H_x^2+H_z^2}\,.$

Equation (13) has two solutions: (i) a homogeneous solution $u_\uparrow\equiv 0$ corresponding to the insulating state and (ii) the solution $(u_\uparrow^0,u_\downarrow^0)$ having the absolute values

$$|u_\uparrow^0|^2=-\frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{\tilde{\beta}(1+q^2)}\,;\ |u_\downarrow^0|^2=q^2|u_\uparrow^0|^2.\qquad(14)$$

The sum of these two terms equals the total electron density n_{e0} at infinity, $|u_\uparrow^0|^2+|u_\downarrow^0|^2=n_{e0}$.

We introduce the dimensionless function $f(x)$ as $u_\uparrow(x)=u_\uparrow^0f(x)$ and Eq. (13) has the form

$$-\xi_{\vec{H}}{}^2(T)\frac{d^2f}{dx^2}-f+f^3=0\ ,\ \xi_{\vec{H}}(T)=\sqrt{\frac{\hbar^2}{2m|\tilde{\alpha}|}}\quad(15)$$

with the solution $f(x)=\tanh\left[\frac{x}{\sqrt{2}\xi_{\vec{H}}(T)}\right]$. $\xi_{\vec{H}}$ and $f(x)$ are the functions of the magnetic field $\vec{H}$.

The next two matrix rows of Eq. (11) can be examined in the same way. So, we get a solution of Eq. (11) in the explicit form $\Upsilon^+=(u_\uparrow\,,\,u_\downarrow\,,\,v_\uparrow\,,\,v_\downarrow)$. The expression enables to analyze the surface tension due to the order parameter Υ in the magnetic field $\vec{H}$. The free energy $F_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}$ due to the order parameter Υ and $\vec{H}$ per unit area of the interface is

$$F_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}=\int_0^\infty dx\,F_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}\equiv\int_0^\infty dxF_\Upsilon\Upsilon(\vec{r}))+$$
$$\int_0^\infty dx\left[F_{para}(\vec{H}+4\pi\vec{M},\Upsilon,\Upsilon^+)-\vec{H}\vec{M}-\frac{\vec{H}^2}{8\pi}\right]\quad(16)$$

The surface energy $\Sigma_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}$ represents the difference between $F_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}$ and the free energy of the uniform metal phase filling the half-space of the specimen. In the paramagnetic case (16) with $\vec{M}(\vec{r})\equiv 0$, the two last terms in the integrand do not give contribution into $\Sigma_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}$. The calculation is straightforward (cf.[15]) and gives $\Sigma_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}$:

$$\Sigma_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}=\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3}\xi_{\vec{H}}(T)\tilde{\beta}n_0^2\qquad(17)$$

Here n_0 is the bulk density of electrons in metal. And $n_0 = (\Upsilon^+\Upsilon)\,|_{|\vec{r}|\to\infty}$, see (1). If we put n_0 to be of the order of an unit per crystal cell we get for $\Sigma_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}$ (17) the typical value for metals. In addition, $\Sigma_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}}$ is a singular function in the limit $n_0 \Rightarrow 0$, namely $\Sigma_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}} \sim n_0^{3/2}$ as $n_0 \Rightarrow 0$. And also $\Sigma_{\Upsilon,\vec{H}} \sim (\rho - \rho_{c\vec{H}})^{3/2}$ in the limit $\rho \Rightarrow \rho_{c\vec{H}}$, $\quad \rho_{c\vec{H}} = \rho_{c0} - \mu_{ph} H sgn H_x a^{-1}$.

Now we consider the second situation

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\left(\frac{d^2\Upsilon}{dx^2}\right) + \alpha\Upsilon + \beta\left(\Upsilon^+\Upsilon\right)\Upsilon - \vec{H}\frac{\partial\vec{M}}{\partial(\Upsilon^+\Upsilon)}\Upsilon = 0$$

We assume that $\vec{M}(\vec{r})$ depends on electron density $n(\vec{r})$ or $(\Upsilon^+\Upsilon)$ and does not depend on $\rho(\vec{r})$, i.e.

$$\vec{M}(\vec{r}) = \vec{M}(n(\vec{r}))\ ,\ \ n(\vec{r}) = \Upsilon^+(\vec{r})\Upsilon(\vec{r})$$

In this case we can put components of $\Upsilon(x)$ and $\Upsilon^+(x)$ in the form of real functions which do not vary in spin space and depend on x: $\Upsilon^+(x) = \chi(x)(s_{u\uparrow}, s_{u\downarrow}, s_{v\uparrow}, s_{v\downarrow})$, $s_{u\uparrow}, s_{u\downarrow}$ and $s_{v\uparrow}, s_{v\downarrow}$ are components of two vectors in spin space and are normalized by the condition

$$\Upsilon^+(x)\Upsilon(x) = \chi^2(x) = n(x)\,.$$

We arrive at the equation for the scalar function $\chi(x)$:

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\frac{d^2\chi}{dx^2} = \alpha\chi + \beta\chi^3 - \vec{H}\frac{\partial\vec{M}}{\partial(n(x))}\chi \qquad (18)$$

If we assume $\lim|_{\chi\Rightarrow 0}\ \left\{\chi * \frac{\partial\vec{M}}{\partial(n(x)}\right\} \Rightarrow 0$, the Eq.(18) has two uniform solutions: 1) the solution $\chi \equiv 0$ for the insulating phase, 2) the solution χ_0 for the metallic phase: $\chi_0^2 = |\alpha|/\beta$. The function $\chi(x)$ satisfies the following boundary conditions: $\chi = 0$, at $x = 0$ and $\chi \Rightarrow \chi_0$, at $x \Rightarrow \infty$. We multiply (18) by $d\chi/dx$ and find the first integral of it:

$$-\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\left(\frac{d\chi}{dx}\right)^2 - |\alpha|\chi^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}\chi^4 - \vec{H}\vec{M}(\chi^2) = C_0 \qquad (19)$$

C_0 can be found from the boundary conditions. So,

$$C_0 = -|\alpha|\chi_0^2 + \frac{\beta}{2}\chi_0^4 - \vec{H}\vec{M}(\chi_0^2)\,;\ \chi^2(x) \equiv n(x)\,.$$

$$\frac{\hbar^2}{2m}\left(\frac{d\chi}{dx}\right)^2 = -|\alpha|(\chi^2 - \chi_0^2) + \frac{\beta}{2}(\chi^4 - \chi_0^4) - \\ -\vec{H}(\vec{M}(\chi^2) - \vec{M}(\chi_0^2)). \qquad (20)$$

From the last equation the function $\chi(x)$ can be extracted in the implicit form. And the surface tension due to the order parameter χ can be written as follows:

$$\Sigma_\Upsilon = \hbar\sqrt{\frac{\beta}{m}}\int_0^{\chi_0} d\chi\Gamma^{1/2}(\chi)\theta(\Gamma(\chi))\ ,$$
$$\Gamma(\chi) = \left[(\chi_0^2 - \chi^2)^2 + 2\beta^{-1}\vec{H}(\vec{M}(\chi_0^2) - \vec{M}(\chi^2))\right] \qquad (21)$$

Here $\theta(\upsilon) = 0$ for $\upsilon < 0$; $\theta(\upsilon) = 1$ for $\upsilon > 0$. The presence of $\theta(\Gamma(\chi))$ in the integrand of (21) leads to the appearance of a singularity of the value Σ_Υ for $H = 0$. It leads also to singularities in the points where $\vec{M}$ becomes zero. If $\vec{H} \equiv 0$,

$$\Sigma_{\Upsilon 0} = \Sigma_\Upsilon|_{H\Rightarrow 0} = \frac{2\hbar}{3\beta\sqrt{m}}|\alpha|^{3/2} \qquad (22)$$

Below we consider Σ_Υ for Pauli paramagnetism and Landau diamagnetism [2]. In both cases the magnetic moment $\vec{M}$ can be represented as $\vec{M} = \mu_H\vec{B}$. In the case of the Pauli paramagnetism $\mu_H = \mu_{para} = 1/2 * (1/2\pi)^2\left(e^2/\hbar c\right)(p_F/mc)$. In the case of the Landau diamagnetism $\mu_H = \mu_{dia} = -\frac{1}{3}\mu_{para}$; $p_F = (3\pi^2)^{1/3}\hbar n^{1/3}$ is Fermi momentum. Σ_Υ (21) equals:

$$\Sigma_\Upsilon = 1.5 * \Sigma_{\Upsilon 0}\int_0^1 dx\Gamma_1^{1/2}(x)\theta(\Gamma_1(x))\ ,$$
$$\Gamma_1(x) = \left[(1-x^2)^2 \pm DG_\pm(1 - x^{2/3})\right]^{1/2} \qquad (23)$$

$D = 2\beta\mu_{eff}H^2/|\alpha|$, $\mu_{eff} = 1/(2\pi)^2)(e^2/\hbar c)(p_{eff}/mc)$,

$$p_{eff} = \hbar\left(3\pi^2\aleph\rho_c/\beta\right)^{1/3}\ .$$

Here μ_{eff} is the effective susceptibility and p_{eff} is the effective Fermi momentum. In the low magnetic field ($D \ll 1$) we represent Σ_Υ as follows:

$$\Sigma_\Upsilon = \Sigma_{\Upsilon 0} + \Delta\Sigma_\Upsilon\,. \qquad (24)$$

In the cases of Pauli paramagnetism and Landau diamagnetism we have

$$\Delta\Sigma_{\Upsilon,Pauli} \cong 0.536H^2\frac{3^{1/3}}{4\pi^{2/3}}\frac{\hbar e^2}{cm^{3/2}}\frac{1}{|\alpha|^{1/6}\beta^{1/3}}$$
$$\Delta\Sigma_{\Upsilon,Landau} \cong -0.290H^2\frac{3^{1/3}}{4\pi^{2/3}}\frac{\hbar e^2}{cm^{3/2}}\frac{1}{|\alpha|^{1/6}\beta^{1/3}} \qquad (25)$$

When T goes to T_c, $|\alpha| \Rightarrow 0$ and $|\Delta\Sigma_\Upsilon|$ rises. The value is restricted by the condition $D \ll 1$. It means a reduction of surface tension Σ_Υ in the case of Landau diamagnetism and an increase of it in the case of Pauli paramagnetism. The asymmetry of behavior of the value of Σ_Υ between Landau diamagnetism and Pauli paramagnetism increases for larger values of D. In the limit $D \gg 1$ we have for Pauli paramagnetism $\Sigma_\Upsilon \gg \Sigma_{\Upsilon 0}$:

$$\Sigma_{\Upsilon;Pauli} \cong G_+^{1/2}|\alpha|^{-1}\mu_{eff}^{1/2}H\Sigma_{\Upsilon 0} \sim |\alpha|^{2/3}\ , \qquad (26)$$

For Landau diamagnetism:

$$\Sigma_{\Upsilon;Landau} \equiv 0\,,\quad D \succeq 4.645\ . \qquad (27)$$

It is seen from (23) that $\Sigma_\Upsilon \geq 0$. It should be emphasized that the value of surface tension in magnetic field Σ_Υ can strongly differ from the value of $\Sigma_{\Upsilon 0}$ in the absence

of magnetic field. In particularly, Σ_Υ decreases for the case of Landau diamagnetism and can be done even zero. In the opposite case of Pauli paramagnetism Σ_Υ can be done substantially more than $\Sigma_{\Upsilon 0}$. This effect leads to a strong asymmetry of the phase transition kinetics for diamagnetic and paramagnetic materials in the magnetic field. This effect is very important even in low magnetic fields. It is connected with the exponential dependence of probability for thermal nucleation as a function of the value of surface tension. The probability in the process of phase transition[2] equals approximately:

$$W = \omega_{th} \exp\left(-\frac{U_0}{T}\right) s^{-1}; \quad \omega_{th} = \frac{\omega_0 V}{4\pi R_c^3/3}. \qquad (28)$$

Here V is the volume of the system, R_c is the critical radius of thermal fluctuations and ω_0 is the frequency of heterophase fluctuations in the metastable phase, i.e. the characteristic frequency of small oscillations in the potential well of a nucleus of the stable phase. Usually, ω_0 can be estimated numerically by the order of the magnitude as about the Debye frequency ω_D. It should be emphasized that the value of ω_{th} is really great (cf.[8, 21]):

$$\omega_{th} \simeq \exp(N_0)\, s^{-1}, \;\; N_0 \gg 1. \qquad (29)$$

For the system with the volume $V \approx 1cm^3$, $\omega_D \approx 10^{11} s^{-1}$, and the critical radius R_c of about several interatomic distances, we have $N_0 \approx 80$. We should note that in real experiment the critical R_c should be not more than several interatomic distances. In opposite case (see e.g.[21]), the time of decay of the metastable system ($\sim 1/W$) will exceed the time of existence of our Universe. The same dramatic situation takes place also for quantum nucleation[8, 21]. Small corrections of R_c of the order of N_0^{-1} lead to modulation of the value W of the order of unity (see (29)). For example, if a variation of the surface tension is of the order ten percent, the modification of W is about ~ 2500 or $\sim 1/2500$. So, if $D \sim 0.1$ in Eq (23), W increases in ~ 2500 times for the case of Landau diamagnetism and decreases in ~ 2500 times for the case of Pauli paramagnetism. In the vicinity of phase transition the value $D \sim 1$ can be reached even for extremely small magnetic fields because $|\alpha| \Rightarrow 0$. So, the probability for thermal nucleation W in the presence of magnetic field for diamagnetic substances is much more than that for paramagnetic substances. Probably, this fact accounts for the well known diamagnetic behavior of all semimetals [10]. The possible reason of this behavior is the kinetic nature of stable phase nucleation in the metastable environment with a small barrier due to the small surface tension. So, the growth of diamagnetic semimetals is much more probable than of paramagnetic ones. To verify this assumption experimentally it is necessary to investigate the phase transition kinetics by shielding the magnetic field. The other possible verification can be done by carrying out the experiment in an altering in time magnetic field.

In summary, it is built a new approach to MI phase transition kinetics. It is based on two order parameters of sufficiently different nature. The equations of GL type are formulated for these two order parameters. Effects of magnetic field are included in the kinetics of MI phase transition kinetics. The exact solution of equations is obtained for paramagnetic case (11) with nontrivial behavior as a function of the uniform magnetic field $\vec{H}$. It is shown a radically different behavior of MI phase transition for Landau diamagnetism and Pauli paramagnetism cases.

The author thanks S.N.Burmistrov and Yu.Kagan for valuable critical comments. The work is supported in part by the Grant of RFBR No 16-02-00382.

* Dubovskiy˙LB@rrcki

[1] N. F. Mott, "Metal–Insulator" Second Edition Taylor@Francis London–New York–Philadelphia,1990.

[2] L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz . Statistical Physics. Part 1: Course of Theoretical Physics, Vol. 5 (3rd ed.) Publisher: Butterworth-Heinemann; 3 edition, 1980.

[3] P. M. Chaikin and T. C. Lubensky, Principles of Condensed Matter Physics, Cambridge university press, 1995.

[4] Jinwu Ye, Phys. Rev. Lett., **97**, 125302 (2006)

[5] L. Dubovskii, JETP Letters **99**, No. 1, pp. 22-26 (2014).

[6] L. Dubovskii, J. Low Temp. Phys. **182**, 192-205 (2016).

[7] J. W. Cahn and J. E. Hillard, J. Chem. Phys. **28** ,258 (1958); ibid. **42** , 93, (1964).

[8] I. M. Lifshits and Yu. Kagan. Sov. Phys. JETP 35, 206 (1972)

[9] L. P. Pitaevskii, E. M. Lifshitz. Statistical Physics, Part 2. Vol. 9 (1st ed.), 1980.

[10] Tables of physical quantities. Editor I. K. Kikoin. M., Atomizdat, 1976 (in Russian).

[11] M.B. Partensky UFN, 128, 69 (1979).

[12] G. Vignale, M. Rasolt, D. J. W. Geldart, Adv. Quantum Chem. **21**, 235 (1990).

[13] G. Vignale and M. Rasolt, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2360 (1987); G. Vignale, PRB **37** 10865 (1988).

[14] V.L. Ginzburg and L.D. Landau, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 20, 1064 (1950). English translation in: L. D. Landau, Collected papers (Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1965) p. 546

[15] P. G. De Gennes. Superconductivity of Metals and Alloys, W. A. Benjamin, INC. New York, 1966.

[16] E. G. Maksimov. Phys. Usp. 53, 11851190 (2010).

[17] A. K. Rajagopal and J. Callaway, Phys. Rev. **B7**, 1912 (1973).

[18] C. J. Grayce, R. A. Harris, Phys. Rev. **A50**, 3089 (1994).

[19] L.D. Landau, E.M. Lifshitz. Vol. 8. Electrodynamics of Continuous Media (2ed., Pergamon), 1984.

[20] A.A. Abrikosov. Fundamentals of the theory of metals, NY Butterworth-Heinemann, 1988.

[21] S. N. Burmistrov and L. B. Dubovskii, Sov. Phys. JETP 66, 414 (1987).